

Amendments To The Drawings:

None

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **March 6, 2008**.

Claims 1-16 were previously pending in the present application. Of those, claims 1, 8, 9 and 16 are independent and claims 2-7 and claims 10-15 depend directly from claim 1 and claim 9, respectively. All of the pending claims were rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 8 and 10-16 have been amended, claim 9 has been canceled, and new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 1-8 and 10-18 are pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, in order to advance prosecution, claims 1, 8 and 16 have been amended to specify that



in the chemical formula is a bond when n is zero, and claim 9 is canceled.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 9-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugihara et al. (US 5,705,089). Claims 9-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. (US 2004/0029395 A1). Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oshima (US 2002/0194789 A1). Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skee (US 2002/0077259 A1).

In response, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to clarify that the polishing composition

consists of a specific chelating agent, an alkali compound, silicon dioxide, and water. Further, claim 9 has been canceled and claims 10-16 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from claim 8.

Oshima discloses a polishing composition comprising an abrasive such as silicon dioxide, an oxidizing agent such as hydrogen peroxide, an organic phosphonic acid such as ethylenediaminetetramethylenephosphonic acid and diethylenetriaminepentamethylenephosphonic acid, and water. Oshima also discloses that the polishing composition may further comprise a basic substance such as an aqueous ammonia, potassium hydroxide, sodium hydroxide, and an amine. However, Oshima fails to disclose or suggest a polishing composition consisting of an abrasive, an organic phosphonic acid, a basic substance, and water. That is, Oshima fails to disclose or suggest a polishing composition as recited in claims 1 and 8 as amended.

For the above reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C 102(c). Since claims 2-7 and 10-16 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 8, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not anticipated by any of the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kido (US 2002/0059755 A1) in view of Carter et al. (US 2003/0082998 A1).

Kido discloses a polishing composition comprising water, a cerium oxide abrasive, a chelating agent such as ethylenediaminetetramethylenephosphonic acid and diethylenetriaminepentamethylenephosphonic acid. Kido also discloses that the polishing composition may further comprise another abrasive such as silicon dioxide. However, Kido does not disclose or suggest that a cerium oxide abrasive may be **excluded** from the polishing composition. There is no reason for a person skilled in the art to exclude a cerium oxide abrasive from the polishing composition of Kido, because such exclusion would go against the teaching of Kido. Therefore, a polishing composition as recited in claims 1 and 8 cannot be obvious based on the combination of Kido in view of Carter. Neither reference would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to exclude the Kido abrasive.

In addition, the claimed invention solves the technical problem of suppressing wafer

contamination caused by metal impurities. Neither Kido nor Carter disclose or suggest such a technical problem, let alone any solution for it.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a). Since claims 2-7 and 10-16 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 8, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not unpatentable over Kido in view of Carter.

Newly Added Claims

New claim 17 is directed to a polishing composition consists of a specific chelating agent, an alkali compound, silicon dioxide, water, and at least one selected from the group consisting of a surfactant and an antiseptic agent. New claim 18 is directed to a process for polishing a silicon wafer using the polishing composition according to new claim 17. A surfactant and an antiseptic agent are described in the specification at page 15, lines 7-9.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing it is believed that the present application, with claims 1-8, 10-18 is in condition for allowance. Early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: July 7, 2008

By: /Scott Q. Vidas/
Scott Q. Vidas
Registration No.: 30812

6640 Shady Oak Dr., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001